

## REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings; required a new title; indicated that the abstract should be revised; objected to claims 2-9; rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,557,617 to Sherry; rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Applicants' admitted prior art at page 1 of the specification; and indicated that claims 1-9 are allowable.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 1-9.

Applicants have changed the title; and amended claims 1-10. Claims 1-18 are pending in the patent application, of which claims 1-10 are presented for examination.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's objection to the drawings, and submit that the drawings indeed show each feature of the claimed invention. Nevertheless, in order to expedite prosecution of the present application, Applicants have amended claim 1 by deleting the following language:

wherein when pins in the pin connectors are pushed out of the pin connectors from a rear side of the backplane, the pins fall onto said bottom surface of said catch basin module and do not fall into the chassis of the telecommunications device.

Similar language has been deleted from claim 10. Claim 10, however, has been further amended to recite a window configured to receive pin connections. Fig. 4, for example, clearly shows a

window 26, and thus provides exemplary support for the changes to claim 10. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the objection to the drawings.

In response to the Examiner's requirement of a new title, Applicants have changed the title, as proposed by the Examiner at page 3 of the Office Action.

With respect to the Examiner request for revisions to the Abstract, Applicants respectfully submit that the Abstract, in its current form, reflects subject matter recited in the claims 1-10, presumably the "structure claims" referenced by the Examiner at page 3 of the Office Action. For example, claim 1 recites a catch basin including a bottom surface, and a rear wall having a window. The Abstract provides exemplary support for these claim limitations at lines 2-8. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that no changes to the Abstract are required. Should the Examiner believe that changes to the Abstract are necessary, however, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to contact the undersigned with any proposed changes, or provide clarification as to any perceived informalities.

With respect to the Examiner's objection to claims 2-9, Applicants have amended each of these claims at line 1 to recite "The" instead of "An". Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection to claims 2-9.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) and (b) as being anticipated by

Sherry and Applicants' admitted prior art. Claim 10, as amended is not anticipated by the applied prior art, because neither teaches or suggests each and every element of the claim. In particular, neither Sherry nor Applicants' admitted prior art discloses the claimed combination including a catch basin module having a window, as recited in amended claim 10.


In formulating the rejections under Section 102, the Examiner has asserted that Sherry and Applicants' admitted prior art disclose a catch basin module. According to the Examiner, the "catch basin" of Sherry corresponds to module 16. In addition, the claimed catch basin module allegedly reads on general teachings of a module at page 1 of Applicants' specification. Applicants note, however, that although module 16 of Sherry has a window, presumably through which an erasable programmable memory (EPROM) can be exposed (see col. 11, lines 50-52), such a window is not configured to receive connector pins. Moreover, Applicants' specification at page 1 is entirely silent as to any opening whatsoever for receiving connector pins. Accordingly, neither Sherry nor Applicants' admitted prior art teach the claimed catch basin module having a window configured to receive connector pins, as recited in amended claim 10. Claim 10, therefore, is allowable over the applied prior art.

In light of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application and a timely allowance of the pending claims.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicants respectfully petitions for a three month extension of time for filing a reply in connection with the present application, and the required fee of \$930.00 is attached hereto.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 02-2448. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

By:  #39,491  
for David L. Soltz  
Reg. No. 34,731

Date: July 9, 2003